12. (New) The semiconductor device in accordance with Claim 11, wherein the metal wiring layer covers a part of the insulating layer.



13. (New) The semiconductor device in accordance with Claim 12, wherein the semiconductor device is an insulated gate bipolar transistor, and wherein the region irradiated is a positive-negative junction where a parasitic diode is generated.

14. (New) The semiconductor device in accordance with Claim 12, wherein the semiconductor device is a metal oxide semiconductor field effect transistor, and wherein the region irradiated is a positive-negative junction region where a parasitic diode is generated.

## REMARKS

Minor corrections have been made to the specification. The title has been made more descriptive. Claims 1-8 have been canceled, without prejudice. Claims 9-14 have been added. Claims 9-14 remain pending. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application, as amended, are requested.

Applicant acknowledges the election of claims 1-7, without traverse. Claims 1-7 have now been canceled, without prejudice. Claims 9-14 replace claims 1-7 and are within the scope of the election.

The Examiner objected to the title as not being descriptive. The title has been amended to be made more descriptive. It is submitted that the title is acceptable.

The disclosure was objected to because of certain informalities. The informalities have been considered and the specification appropriately amended where necessary. Figure 9 has been amended to include numerals "21" and "82". A marked-up copy of Figure 9 is enclosed for approval.

The Examiner objected to the drawings by indicating that the thinner wiring wire at the irradiated region, as recited in claim 1, was not shown. Claim 1 has been canceled. The new claims do not claim a thinner wiring layer.

The Examiner objected to claims 1-7 because of a misspelling of the word "wiring". It is believed that corrections have been made where necessary.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. The Examiner indicated that there was no support in the specification for a wiring layer at the irradiated region being thinner than the wiring layer at other regions, as recited in claim 1. This limitation is no longer claimed in the new claims.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner indicated several phrases as being troublesome. The original claims have been canceled and now replaced with new claims. It is submitted that the new claims are definite.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious on consideration of *Mori et al.* or *Kinzer*.

*Mori et al.* is directed to the structure of a power semiconductor device.

*Kinzer* is directed to a power transistor device having heavy metal doping.

Claim 9 is an independent claim and claims 10-14 depend from it. Claim 9 is directed to a semiconductor device which includes a substrate having region irradiated with radiating rays, crystal defects within the region irradiated, and a metal wiring layer located over the substrate. The metal wiring layer is made of a light metal. The metal wiring layer has an opening above the region irradiated so that radiating rays passing to the region irradiated through the opening generate the crystal defects within the region irradiated.

Claim 9 requires structure such that a metal wiring layer of a light metal is located over the substrate so as to have an opening above a region irradiated with radiating rays which cause crystal defects within the region irradiated. Neither *Mori* nor *Kinzer* discloses such structure. *Mori* discloses the structure of a power semiconductor, but does not disclose a light metal wiring layer having an opening over a region irradiated with radiating rays that have caused crystal defects within the region irradiated. Likewise, *Kinzer* discloses the structure and manufacturing method of a power transistor device which includes implanting heavy metals through windows. *Kinzer,* however, does not disclose a light metal wiring layer located over the substrate which has an opening over a region irradiated with radiating rays such that the radiating rays cause crystal defects within the region irradiated. The references do not point to the structure claimed in claim 9. Hence, claim 9 does not follow from and is nonobvious over the cited references. Claims 10-14 depend from claim 9 and further definite it. They are also patentable.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are requested. Allowance of claims 9-14 at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Dated: 2-28-01

By Curtis B. Hamre

Curtis B. Hamre
Reg. No. 29,165
CBH:PSTcmz

K:\CLIENTS\10\10233\81USW1\Amendment.doc